DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 446 HE 033 044

AUTHOR	Nies, Charles; Wolverton, Mimi
TITLE	Mentoring Deans.
PUB DATE	2000-04-00
NOTE	26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Deans; *Administrator Effectiveness; Administrator Qualifications; Administrator Role; *College Administration; *Deans; Higher Education; *Leadership Qualities; Organizational Effectiveness; Private Colleges; School Administration; State Universities; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	Washington State University

ABSTRACT

This paper, which examines mentor relationships of academic deans, is part of a study conducted by the Center for Academic Leadership at Washington State University between October 1996 and January 1997. The study sample consisted of 1,370 deans (response rate 60 percent) at 360 public and private institutions, and the survey gathered information about deans' personal and institutional demographics, perceptions of role conflict and ambiguity, job responsibilities, perceptions of job-related stress, and their understanding of leadership. After reviewing other research on the subject, the report examines informal and formal mentoring; concepts of sponsorship and mentorship and the influence of tenure; networking; coaching; mentoring relationships (of women and as related to race and ethnicity); and deans and mentoring. The study reports that while deans benefit from mentoring, regardless of race or gender, less than 50 percent receive mentoring support. It was found that the greatest obstacle to mentoring is that it is a predominantly voluntary, unrecognized, and unrewarded system that requires a great deal of initiative to begin and to maintain the relationship for both the mentee and the mentor. Five data tables are appended. (Contains approximately 38 references.) (CH)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 442 446

Mentoring Deans

by

Charles Nies
Mimi Wolverton
Washington State University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Presented
at
AERA Conference
New Orleans, Louisiana
April 2000

C. Nies

AE 033 044

The concept of mentoring has a long history, one that comes from Greek mythology. In Homer's Odyssey, Mentor was the teacher of Telemachus, the son of Odysseus. During Odysseus' lengthy voyage to fight the Trojan War, Mentor gave Telemachus support and guidance until the return of his father (Daloz, 1983). Thus, the term mentor has been associated with similar activity.

Current themes found in the multitude of definitions of mentoring focus on a relationship that facilitates, guides, and encourages continuous learning and growth to prepare either an individual or an organization for the future (Daloz, 1983, Cohen & Galbraith, 1995; Golian, 1995; Johnson, 1997). A mentor is a loyal friend, confidant, advisor, teacher, coach, and role model. They have been entrusted with the guidance and education of another and are expected to use their knowledge and advanced or expert status to nurture a person's talent.

Research on mentoring supports the positive affect on individuals and organizations (Bey & Holmes, 1990; Phillips-Jones, 1982, 1983; Kram, 1985). In a poll reported by the Wall Street Journal, 90% of the individuals surveyed who had received some form of mentoring found it extremely helpful (Johnson, 1997). It is a concept that continues to receive a significant amount of attention. From 1980 to 1990, over 380 articles appeared in magazines and academic journals on mentoring in business and education (Wunsch, 1994). Yet, despite its high profile, it is estimated that only 38% of men in executive management positions received any form of mentoring (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990).

Due to the nature of academic cultures, sponsorship, networking, and mentoring are intimately tied to career advancement. It appears that mentors can help deans define their responsibilities, set priorities and goals, delineate how much authority they actually have, and manage time effectively, all of which reduce role ambiguity, burnout, and fatigue (Wolverton, Wolverton & Gmelch, 1998). This paper examines the extent to which academic deans receive mentoring and explores it possible impact on their careers.

Informal and Formal Mentoring

Jacobi (1991) states that "although many researchers have attempted to provide concise definitions of mentoring or mentors, definitional diversity continues to characterize the literature" (p.506). Mentoring appears to be defined one way for developmental psychologists and sociologist, another way in the corporate sector, and yet a third way for those in academic settings (Merriam, 1983). Concurrently, the definitional dilemmas affect the identification of the functions and roles within the mentoring process (Cohen, 1995).

Historically, individuals who desired to become mentors looked over aspiring newcomers in thêir profession or field, such as law, medicine, business, arts, or teaching and selected promising young protégés to nurture, much like an apprenticeship. This process is often referred to as informal mentoring (Phillips-Jones, 1998). Though the mentoring process takes place within a contextual setting and involves a relationship of a more knowledgeable individual with a less experienced one, its evolution is more serendipitous than intentional.

In contrast, formal mentoring exists within organizations that have

mentor-matching programs (Phillips-Jones, 1998). Such sponsored mentoring programs are often viewed as pragmatic remedies to turnover within organizations and thought to have a positive impact on an organization's ability to retain its employees (Murray, 1991; Kerr, Schulze, & Woodward, 1995). A concern of formal mentoring programs is the possibility of an incompatible match and the implications of terminating an organizationally endorsed relationship. Phillips-Jones (1989, p.54) emphasizes "[that] even when you've carefully screened and matched pairs, one or more may not work out." Additionally, there is little evidence that assigning mentors is effective (Feinstien, 1987; Zey, 1984).

Sponsorship

The concepts of sponsorship and mentorship and the influence of tenure have been used to explore administrative advancement in organizations (Konrad & Pfeffer, 1991; Forbes & Piercy, 1991). These notions intertwine. For instance, Forbes and Piercy (1991) note that "if decision makers, consciously or unconsciously, look for signals, such as socioeconomic background, [gender, race], or education, then sponsored mobility will occur" (p.41). Such "signaling" is a means of identifying a candidate who is capable of meeting and achieving management's standards for upward mobility. Sponsorship, then, is the identification of talented people and often takes place before any real performance evaluation occurs. "Once the selection is made, many forces come into play to reinforce and validate the decision. Those selected receive special socialization and developmental experience – and before too long, everyone, including the candidates, begins to believe in their ability" (Forbes & Piercy, 1991, p.45). The intertwining concepts of mentoring and sponsorship exist

because sponsorship involves the establishment of mentoring and close relations with supervisors (Forbes, 1987).

Sagaria and Johnsrud (1987) substantiate the importance of sponsorship and career advancement: "Over 70% of the positions at the top three levels are effectively closed to any candidate other than the persons sponsored" (p.24). Rosenbaum (1984) contends that such a system can adversely impact those relegated to outsider status because it builds up the skills, status, and expectations of high potential people, but stifles skill and expectation development in employees who have been eliminated from further consideration by virtue of some preconceived understanding of capability. In effect, it withholds further investments from them by relegating them to low-ability status, thereby creating the allusion that these individuals will not, and cannot, go any further in their career.

Networking

Networking is another concept often associated with mentoring. Research suggests that 75% of all positions are acquired through networking (Heim & Golant, 1993). Networking, loosely defined, is the connection with others for the purpose of sharing information (Heim & Golant, 1993). The networking understanding of mentoring entails flexible and mutually interdependent patterns of training, information sharing, and support (Swoboda & Millar, 1986). It is often viewed in broader terms than mentoring, and includes individuals from within and outside the organization, peers, receptionist, superiors, and subordinates. However, networking is often viewed as a role within a mentoring relationship.

Coaching

Coaching is another term often used interchangeably with mentoring. The distinction made, however, is that coaching is a subset of mentoring (Johnson, 1997). "Mentoring focuses on growth and development at the global or macro level, while coaching usually refers to specific skill development, such as public speaking or the art of delegation" (Johnson, 1997, p.5).

Mentoring Relationships

Establishing a positive mentoring relationship is very much like establishing other valued human relationships. Both parties usually have a genuine desire to understand the values and expectations of the other person, and to respect and become sensitive to one another's feelings and needs (Phillips-Jones, 1989). At the same time, mentoring relationships differ in an important way from other personal relationships because they are assumed to be professional in nature. Mentors are responsible for conveying and upholding the standards, norms, and values of the profession. They are responsible for offering support for the recipient of their mentoring and challenging him or her to fulfill the profession's expectations.

Healthy mentoring relationships are evolutionary rather than static in nature. They change because the purpose of the relationship is to enable the recipient to acquire new knowledge, skill, and standards of professional competence. A number of researchers have identified relationship stages that develop during the mentoring process (Phillips-Jones, 1977; Zey, 1984; Kram, 1983). Most of these include an initial stage, often referred to as initiation or the exploratory stage. Here the mentor and recipient become acquainted and informally clarify their common interests, shared values and professional goals.

The engagement or cultivation stage is when the mentor and recipient communicate initial expectations and agree upon some common procedures and expectations as a starting point. Gradually, needs are fulfilled, objectives are met, and professional growth takes place.

Most research on mentoring identifies a point when the relationship ends and the mentee becomes independent. This stage leads to the final stage of redefinition or transition, and the mentor and recipient redefine their relationship as colleagues, peers, partners, and friends.

Women and Mentoring

The different expectations in mentoring relationships between men and women are assumed to be centered around differences in gender communication rather than differences in needs (Phillips-Jones, 1998). Tannen's (1990) research on men and women in conversation refers to the difference as rapport talk and report talk. Women try to establish closeness through talking, making contact, and sharing details of their lives, thus building rapport. Men use communication as a means to exchange information, make points, reach objectives, give instructions, or share their opinions. Consequently, in a mentoring relationship between a man and woman, the characteristically different conversational styles complicate the relationship and lead to a perceived ineffectiveness (Phillips-Jones, 1998).

Eberspacher and Sisler (1988) established that women, who themselves had been mentored by women, advanced the careers of proteges to higher levels and served as sponsors for movement to administration. McNeer (1983) found that women chief administrators and chief academic officers appeared to be serving as both role models and mentors for other women to a great extent.

This finding is at odds with Warner's (1988) determination that "women in first positions [of academic administration] were less likely to be nominated or recruited" (p.6). Collins (1982) corroborates Warner's results and claims that minorities in academic administration usually have to solicit sponsorship for advancement and are rarely offered sponsorship as an option early in their career. This is disturbing when one considers the importance of sponsorship in career advancement (Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1987) and the barriers that may exist for women who attempt to move into male dominated fields (Henry, 1994).

Some career women have expressed concern that it is difficult to find a mentor (DuBrin, 1990). This is because most of the individuals in senior positions are male executives who are hesitant to take on a female mentee because they fear being suspected of romantic involvement. Additionally, the relative scarcity of women in such senior positions makes it difficult to find a woman to serve in that mentoring capacity (Henry, 1994).

Race, Ethnicity and Mentoring

Mentors represent key relationships attributed to career success and, although research results are inconclusive as to whether women and minorities find fewer mentors than do White men, there is some indication that mentor relationships are harder to manage and thus, may provide a narrower range of benefits for women and men (Kram, 1974; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). Crossrace relationships take longer to initiate, are more likely to end in an unfriendly fashion, and provide less psychosocial support than same-race relationships (Feinstein, 1987). Because mentoring is rooted in the development of a close personal relationship, these barriers may affect crossrace mentoring.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Despite the difficulty finding mentors, researchers do not identify any race-specific functions of a mentor that differ from general definitions and mentor role expectations (Howard-Vital & Morgan, 1993; Schneider, 1991). Career development functions and helping to establish smooth, ongoing work relationships are critical roles that mentors play for members of minority populations who face race based stereotypes (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990).

Deans and Mentoring

In a study conducted by Moore (1983) on higher education administrators, including presidents, provosts, vice presidents, and deans, more than one-half of all administrators had mentors; the percentage was slightly higher for females and minorities. Ninety-five percent of these mentors were male. Almost 70% of the minority status administrators claimed that this mentor relationship had been extremely important in their professional careers, while less than one-half of the White administrators in the sample felt the same way (Moore, 1983).

The Study

The study, from which this paper derives, examines the academic deanship as a multifaceted phenomenon. Its overall goal is to establish a baseline of information about deans in the United States. It was conducted by the Center for Academic Leadership at Washington State University.[1] The resulting database includes deans' personal and institutional demographic specifics, their perceptions of role conflict and ambiguity, views of the responsibilities associated with the position, perceptions of job-related stress

[1] The Center is sponsored and partially funded by the University Council on Educational Administration (UCEA).

and the factors associated with it, and understanding of leadership.

Between October 1996 and January 1997, academic deans in the United States were mailed the *1996 National Survey of Academic Deans in Higher Education* (Gmelch, Wolverton, Wolverton & Hermanson, 1996). The following criteria were used to construct the sample. Potential sample institutions came from one of the following three groupings of Carnegie classifications— Research I & II and Doctoral I & II; Masters I & II; or Baccalaureate I & II. In order to make comparisons of institutions across Carnegie classifications, researchers attempted to control for some of the differentiation that exists across categories. To do this, researchers limited the potential institutional population to those universities that had four colleges in common. From this initial group of colleges and universities, 60 public and 60 private institutions were randomly selected from each Carnegie category resulting in a sample of 360 institutions. At each of the sample institutions, the deans of the colleges of education, business, liberal arts, and allied health professions were then asked to complete the survey. In a few instances, colleges of social work or a similar discipline were also included in the survey. Based on experiences gained in survey research done on department chairs where 10% of the sample were women, researchers made the assumption that a similar pattern would reveal itself in deans if a completely random sample were collected. Consequently, in a purposeful attempt to increase the number of female respondents, researchers included colleges of nursing and public health. The overall sample size consisted of 1,370 deans, with a response rate of 60%.

Research instruments used in the survey include the Dean's Stress Inventory (Gmelch,et al., 1996), Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity

Questionnaire (Rizzo, House & Litzman, 1970), Dean's Task Inventory (Gmelch et al., 1996), Satisfaction with Dean's Role (Gmelch et al., 1996), Dean's Leadership Inventory (Rosenbach & Sashkin, 1995) and demographic and contextual variables (Gmelch et al., 1996).

General Profile of Deans in the Study

The responses received generated a relatively well balanced sample both in terms of gender and institution type. Forty-one percent of the responding deans were women. Of the respondents, 58% work in public institutions, 42% in private universities. One-third are deans in research universities (44% of this subgroup were female); 46% are at comprehensive universities (38% female); the remaining 21% are located at baccalaureate institutions (42% female).

Roughly 12% of the respondents hold minority status with African-Americans comprising more than one-half of this segment of the sample. The minority-status pool is evenly divided along gender lines. Thirty-two percent of the minority respondents are deans at research universities; 42% are located at comprehensive universities; the remaining 26% work at baccalaureate colleges.

Of the total responses, 29% of the deans work in colleges or schools of education, 29% in liberal arts, 23% in nursing or public health, and 18% in business. Female deans make up 35% of the education dean respondents, 31% of those in liberal arts, 83% of the nursing and public health respondents, but only 9% of the business college deans. When only the women in the sample are considered, 48% of all female deans who responded are deans in nursing colleges; 25% are from education; 23% are from liberal arts; 4% serve as deans of colleges of business.

Deans, on average, are 54 years old and have served in their current positions for 5.6 years. Sixteen percent of the respondents had served in their positions for one year or less. Only 12.8% had been deans for more than 10 years. About two-thirds of responding deans were dissatisfied with their current, personal research productivity. But, overwhelmingly, most (more than 90%) believed that universities are good places to work.

Findings

In regrards to mentoring, 55% of the deans in the study had mentors. More than one-half of the female deans in the study had mentors; most of these had been White; the majority had been other women. The male profile was similar in that more than one-half of the deans had mentors, the majority of whom were White and male. (See Table 1 and Table 2).

For Deans of Color in the study, just over one-half of them had mentors; the majority of these mentors were male (64%) and White (51%). The significant differences between deans of color and non-minority status deans appeared in certain aspects of mentorship. Minority status deans were less likely to have been mentored by someone within their own institutions (*p*-value = .08) and less likely to have had non-minority mentors (*p*-value = .00). (See Table 3).

The lowest percentage of deans with mentors manifested itself in the business colleges (50%), the highest in the college of nursing (65%). (See Table 4). Mentors for business deans were other males (95%) and for deans of nursing colleges, other women (68%). Education deans were less likely to have mentors at their own institutions, and their mentors were more likely to be male. (See Table 5).

Due to the diversity of definitions of mentoring, how deans used networking relationships was also explored. A significant difference between genders emerged. Men used their networking relationships when making difficult personal decisions (p-value = .021). Women, on the other hand, used their networking relationships to explore ideas (p-value = .000) and when coping with frustrations (p-value = .078). No significant difference existed between racial groups.

Implications

While the initial implication for higher education is that deans benefit from mentoring, regardless of race or gender, the fact that nearly 50% do not receive mentoring support is a concern. From tenure to other career advancement processes, mentoring can be critical in assisting potential deans through the often confusing process of academic advancement. The support provided in a mentoring relationship can assist individuals in the deanship in coping with the stress associated with the current demands of the position.

Beyond the encouragement of mentoring is the recognition that women and racial minorities are moving through the ranks in the academy. The small percentage of deans who are of minority-status, either racial or gender, is an indication that their unique perspectives on deaning may not be recognized, thus limiting their potential sponsorship and mentorship. Additionally, the lack of mentoring for women and people of color may inhibit their career advancement due to barriers. A 1992 study on diversity and leadership in corporate America identified the following six barriers: treating differences as weakness, poor career planning, lonely and non-supportive work environment for nontraditional managers, lack of organizational savvy, greater comfort in dealing with one's own

kind, and difficulty balancing career and family (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). Mentors in senior level positions can help to remove barriers that currently prevent qualified individuals from these populations moving into the deanship.

The significant difference between deans of color having mentors outside of their university when compared to White male deans is an indication that the internal "old boys" networking system may still be very alive. If the concurrent definition of mentoring and sponsorship is the explanation for the significantly higher internal development of mentoring relationships for White men, then this statistic would have implications for the career advancement of racial and ethnic minorities in higher education. The relatively small population of minority status deans translates to a relatively few mentors, with a high likelihood that there will not be more than one or two at a given university. As such, it would be only natural that a dean of color who has a mentor who is also a racial or ethnic minority, would be employed at another institution.

Finally, the greatest obstacle to mentoring lies in the fact that it is a predominately voluntary, unrecognized, and non-rewarded system. It requires a great deal of initiative on the part of the protégé to begin and maintain the relationship and on the mentor to carve out the time and commitment. Although organizations benefit tremendously from these relationships, organizations do not generally provide any incentives or opportunities for these relationships to develop.

Recommendations

The bulk of the current literature on mentoring has as the focus, the development of formal mentor-matching programs. Most of the models stress the importance of implementing a program that meets the needs of the organization with the focus on a systematic design and implementation process. They divide the organization into management hierarchies, and

delineate developmental tracks for more senior members to educate and train junior members (Johnson, 1997). They address matching procedures, upper management support and buy-in, and on-going evaluation and assessment. However, the inconclusive results of formal mentoring program effectiveness and anecdotal reports of being caught in a mentoring pairing that does not work, another option needs to be developed.

Additionally, due to the voluntary nature, the increased and un-rewarded time commitment and responsibility of informal mentoring, there continues to exists the possibility that only 50% of the aspire deans will benefit from such a relationship. The increasing numbers of women and racial minorities moving through the ranks of the faculty hierarchies signals a need to address the mentoring issues faced by these two populations. And, the natural selection process may lead to a form of social-Darwinism, as those deemed worthy of mentoring receive mentoring, and those not identified as having potential hit a career dead end.

One option is a formal mentoring program using a mentoring committee. Similar in structure to graduate faculty committees, an individual is assigned to a three person mentoring committee. Each member brings with him or her different expertise, knowledge, and skills. It broadens the mentees support, provides a higher likelihood of a relationship connection, and addresses the concern of time commitment or potential sabbatical leave on the part of the mentors.

Yet, another option is a formal mentor-mentee training program that is endorsed and rewarded from the top that would prepare individuals for informal mentoring relationships. Such a program would help a potential

mentor to understand his or her role in identifying needs, developing goals, and preparing a plan to help the mentee grow. Awareness training, especially for White men, would be critical who need to overcome their trepidation of mentoring a woman or are unaware of the barriers that exist in crossrace relations. Mentees can receive information on what to look for in a mentor, the responsibilities of a mentee, and what a mentor is looking for in a potential protégé. The commitment to the training would foster an environment that supports mentoring and reinforces a more intentional formation of informal mentoring relationships.

The benefits of a mentor are not in question, as research has suppoted. The transition of deans from a head scholar to a chief officer of a college is also a reality of the changing nature of higher education in the 21st Century. Providing a support system to develop and guide the future leaders of colleges will be critical. Colleges and universities need to expand their commitment to education and leadership development from an intentional focus on their students to include an intentional focus to all members of their educational community, particularly their future leadership.

References

Bey, T. M., & Holmes, C. T. (1990). *Mentoring: Contemporary principles and issues.* Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Cohen, N. H. (1995). *Mentoring adulte learners: A guide for educators and trainers.* Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Cohen, N. H., & Galbraith, M. W. (1995). Mentoring in the learning society. In M. W. Galbraith & N. H. Cohen. (1995). *Mentoring: New strategies and challenges.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Collins, N. W. (1982). *Professional women and their mentors: A practical guide to mentoring for the woman who wants to get ahead.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Daloz, L. A. (1986). *Effective teaching and mentoring: Realizing the transformational power of adult learning experiences.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

DuBrin, A. J. (1990). *Winning office politics: DuBrin's guide for the '90s.* Paramus, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Eberspacher, J., & Sisler, G. (1988). Mentor relationships in academic relationships. *Initiatives, 51*(4), 27-32.

Feinstein, S. (1987, November 10). Women and minority workers in business find a mentor can be a rare commodity. *The Wall Street Journal,* p. 39.

Forbes, J. B. (1987).Early intraorganizational mobility: Patterns and influences. *Academy of Management Journal, 30*(1), 110-125.

Forbes, J. B. & Piercy, J. E. (1991). *Corporate mobility and paths to the top: Studies for human resource management development specialists.* Westport,

CT: Quorum Books.

Gmelch, W. H., Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M. L. & Hermanson, M. (1996). *The 1996 National Survey of Academic Deans in Higher Education.* Pullman, WA: Washington State University, The Center for Academic Leadership.

Golian, L. M. (1995). Strategies and resources for enhancing mentoring relationships. In M. W. Galbraith & N. H. Cohen. (1995). *Mentoring: New strategies and challenges.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Heim, P. & Golant, S.K. (1993). *Hardball for women: Winning at the game of business.* New York: Plume.

Henry, J. S. (1994). A formal mentoring program for junior female faculty: Description and evaluation. *Initiatives, 56*(2), 37-45.

Howard-Vital, M. R. & Morgan, R. (1993). *African American women and mentoring.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Services, No. ED360425).

Jacobi, M. (1991). Mentoring and undergraduate academic success: A literature review. *Review ofEducational Research, 61 (4),* 505-532.

Johnson, H. E. (1997). *Mentoring: For exceptional performance.* Glendale, CA: Griffin.

Kerr, K. M., Schulze, D. R. & Woodward, L. E. (1995). Organizationally sponsored mentoring. In M. W. Galbraith & N. H. Cohen. (1995). *Mentoring: New strategies and challenges.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Konrad, A. M., & Pfeffer, J. (1991). Understanding the hiring of women and minorities in educational institutions. *Sociology of Education, 64*(3), 141-157.

Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Management Journal, 26*(4), 608-625.

Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

McNeer, E. J. (1983). Two opportunities for mentoring: A study of women's career development in higher education administrations. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 47*(1), 8-14.

Merriam, S. B. (1983). Mentors and proteges: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly, 33*(3), 161-173.

Moore, K. M. (1983). *Women and minorities: Leaders in transitions.* University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education.

Morrison, A. M., & Von Glinow, M. A. (1990). Women and minorities in management. *American Psychologist, 45*, 200-208.

Murray, M. (1991). *Beyond the myths and magic of mentoring: How to facilitate an effective mentoring program.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Phillips-Jones, L. (1982). *Mentors and proteges.* New York: Arbor House.

Phillips-Jones, L. (1989). *The mentoring program coordinator's guide.* Grass Valley, CA: Coalition of Counseling Centers.

Phillips-Jones, L. (1998). *The mentor's guide: How to be the kind of mentor you once had – or wish you'd had.* Grass Valley, CA: Coalition of Counseling Centers.

Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 15*, 150-163.

Rosenbach, W. E. & Sashkin, M. (1995). *Leadership Inventory.* Gettysburg: PA: Gettysburg College, Eisenhower Leadership Program.

Rosenbaum J. E. (1984). *Career mobility in corporate hierarchy.* Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Sagaria, M. D. & Johnsrud, L. K. (1987). *Administrative intrainstitutional mobility: The structuring of opportunity.* Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Diego, CA.

Schneider, A. M. (1991). *Mentoring women and minorities into positions of educational leadership: Gender differences and implications for mentoring.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Services, No. ED344843).

Swoboda, M. J. & Miller, S. B. (1986). Networking-Mentoring: Career strategy ofwomen in academic administration. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors 50*(1), 8-13.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand.* New York: William Morrow and Co.

Warner, R. (1988). *Career paths in higher education administration.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Services, No. ED294596).

Wolverton, M., Wolverton, M. L., & Gmelch, W. H. (1998). *Women in academic deanship.* (Unpublished Manuscript).

Wunsch, M. A. (1994). Editors notes. In M. A. Wunsch (Ed.). *Mentoring revisited: Making an impact on individuals and institutions. New Direction for Teaching and Learning*, 57. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Zey, M. (1984). *The mentor connection.* Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.

TABLE 1: Descriptive Statistics of Male, Female, and Minority-status* Deans

Variable	Number			Mean			SD		
	Male	Female	Minority	Male	Female	Minority	Male	Female	Minority
Mentor	456	311	85	0.64	0.63	0.52	0.5	0.48	0.5
From Inside Current University	227	192	42	0.64	0.65	0.52	0.48	0.48	0.51
Male Mentor	218	188	39	0.85	0.49	0.64	0.36	0.5	0.49
White Mentor	178	158	37	0.92	0.89	0.51	0.28	0.31	0.51

* Slightly more than 1/2 of this group identified as African American

TABLE 2: Mentoring Differences by Gender

	Men		Women		
	M	SD	M	SD	t
Mentor	0.5078	0.5005	0.627	0.4844	3.287*
From Inside Current University	0.6384	0.4815	0.6458	0.4795	0.157
Male Mentor	0.8558	0.3521	0.4894	0.5012	-8.379*
White Mentor	0.9143	0.2807	0.8924	0.3109	-0.671

* $p < .001$

TABLE 3: Mentoring Differences by Race

	White		Racial Minority		
	M	SD	M	SD	t
Mentor	0.5572	0.4971	0.5111	0.5027	-0.825
From Inside Current University	0.6604	0.4742	0.5227	0.5053	-1.72
Male Mentor	0.6842	0.4655	0.6585	0.4801	-0.325
White Mentor	0.9559	0.2056	0.5128	0.5064	-5.406

* $p < .001$

TABLE 4: Networking Differences by Gender

	Men		Women		
	M	SD	M	SD	t
Means of Exploring Ideas	3.4664	0.913	3.6991	0.838	-3.69**
Making Job-related Decisions	3.0938	1.087	3.1379	1.043	-0.57
Making Difficult Personal Decisions	2.3452	1.17	2.1483	1.156	2.31*
Coping with Frustrations/Venting	2.9531	1.153	3.106	1.127	-1.77

** $p < .001$ * $p < .05$

TABLE 5: Descriptive Statistics of Deans by Discipline*

Variable	Number				Mean				SD			
	A	B	E	N	A	B	E	N	A	B	E	N
Mentor	218	135	219	172	0.54	0.5	0.53	0.65	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.48
From Inside Current University	114	66	117	110	0.78	0.59	0.56	0.6	0.42	0.5	0.5	0.49
Male Mentor	110	65	113	106	0.75	0.95	0.82	0.32	0.43	0.21	0.38	0.47
White Mentor	90	50	90	96	0.89	0.96	0.89	0.91	0.32	0.2	0.32	0.29

* A = Liberal Arts; B = Business; E = Education: N = Nursing Health Care